Remarks

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed May 7, 2009 (hereinafter "Office Action"), claim 29 and 65 have been amended. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. Therefore, claims 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 41-56 and 58-88 are currently presented for examination of which claims 29 and 65 are sole independent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 29, 30, 35, 36, 38, 41-49, 52-56, 58-61, 63, 65-74, 77-85 and 87 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,206,778 to Bode et al. ("Bode") in view of Beck et al (hereinafter Beck) , U.S. Patent US 6,718,366 B2.

Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the reason that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for at least the reason that the references relied upon, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

More particularly, neither Bode nor Beck disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "automatically searching the at least one data source in real-time during the communication for the one or more topic words appearing in the monitored communication" as recited in amended claim 29. Bode does not automatically search for "key topics of the communication"

because Bode does not relate to a communication between a user and one other individual in

real-time. Rather Bode requires the user to enter a search guery. Bode receives and searches

based on a "user query input." This is not a "communication between a remote client and one

other individual." Nor does Bode perform filtering of "topic words" appearing in such a

other individual. Nor does bode perform littering of topic words, appearing in such a

communication or "automatically searching \dots during the communication for the one or more

topic words appearing in the monitored communication."

Beck does not cure the deficiencies of Bode. Beck also does not teach "automatically

searching the at least one data source in real-time during the communication for the one or

more topic words appearing in the monitored communication." Beck doesn't take the words

appearing in the monitored communication and search for them rather Beck is taking the

words appearing in the monitored communication and storing them so that one can search

through them. To clarify, when searching there are terms to search for and also a body of

terms to search through. Beck discusses "a search function module 330 is provided and adapted

to searching stored data for pre-defined key-words or phrases similar to the operation of known

search functions" (Beck col 47, L1-4). As described this will search for "a predefined key-word"

and search through stored data, which are customer interactions. So instead of searching for

the words in the communication it is searching **through** the words of the communication. This

is an important distinction and thus does not teach the feature of "automatically searching the

at least one data source in real-time during the communication $\mbox{\it for}$ the one or more topic words

appearing in the monitored communication."

- 12 -

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Bode and Beck fail to disclose each and every feature of independent claim 29. The rejection is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 65 include features similar to those set forth in independent claim 29. Claims 30, 35, 36, 38, 41-49, 52-56, 58-61, 63, 66-74, 77-85 and 87 depend from and add features to one of independent claims 29 and 65. Thus, the rejection of these claims is likewise improper and should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner made the following rejections:

- Claims 58-61, 63, 82-85 and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode et al (hereinafter Bode), U.S. Patent US 7,206,778, in view of Beck et al (hereinafter Beck), U.S. Patent US 6,718,366 B2 and in further view of Fratkina et al (hereinafter Fratkina), U.S. Patent Publication US 200110049688 Al.
- Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode in view of Beck and Teng et al (hereinafter Teng), U.S. Patent 6,976,018.
- Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode in view of Beck and in further view of Burdick et al (hereinafter Burdick), U.S. Patent 7,185,001.
- Claims 50, 51, 75 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode in view of Official Notice.
- Claims 62, 64, 86 and 88, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bode in view of Beck and in further view of Liddy et al. (hereinafter Liddy), U.S. Patent 5,873,056.

Customer No.: 00909

Application Serial No.: 10/736.848

Attorney Docket No. 042846-0312967 Response to Non-Final Office Action mailed May 7, 2009

The dependent claims listed above are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency

on the allowable independent claims. Many of the dependent claims additionally include

separate patentable features. Thus, the rejection of these claims is likewise improper and should

be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full

and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the

application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite

prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the

number provided.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account

Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments

to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Date: August 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Bv:

/Joseph G. Jones, #62151/

Joseph G. Jones

Registration No. 62,151

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

1540 Broadway

New York, NY 10036

Main: 212-858-1309

Direct: 212-858-1309

Fax: 917-464-9553

- 14 -

401375271v1